BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

!	RECEIVED
ť	COMMISSION.
	ooning sing.
	SECRETARIAT

2					
3	In the Matter of)	2006 JAN -9	A ΙΩ: 0.	
4 5	MUR 5630)	CASE CLOSURE UNDER THE	, , 100 ·	
6	REQUEST FOODS INC.)	ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM		
7)			
8)	AFMALTILE		
9)	SENSITIVE		
10					

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

Under the Enforcement Priority System, matters that are low-rated

are forwarded to the Commission with a recommendation for dismissal. The Commission has determined that pursuing low-rated matters compared to other higher rated matters on the Enforcement docket warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss these cases.

The Office of General Counsel scored MUR 5630 as a low-rated matter. In this case, the allegations concerned an alleged corporate prohibited contribution and improper disclaimer involving an advertisement placed in a local newspaper featuring the records of John Kerry and George Bush on abortion legislation. The response indicates that the advertisement was paid for by an individual and was mistakenly attributed to a corporation after the newspaper failed to receive information from the sponsor of the advertisement. The independent expenditure amounted to \$680 and a Form 5 was filed with the Commission shortly after the complaint was submitted. In light of the de minimis nature of the allegations, the disclosure of the expenditure on the public record, and reviewing the merits of MUR 5630 in furtherance of the Commission's priorities and resources relative to other

Case Closure Under EPS – MU. 30 General Counsel's Report Page 2 of 2

- 1 matters pending on the Enforcement docket, the Office of General Counsel believes that the
- 2 Commission should exercise its prosecutorial discretion and dismiss the matter. See Heckler
- 3 v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).

<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>

- 5 The Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission dismiss MUR
- 6 5630, close the file effective two weeks from the date of the Commission vote, and approve
- 7 the appropriate letters. Closing the case as of this date will allow CELA and General Law
- 8 and Advice the necessary time to prepare the closing letters and the case file for the public
- 9 record.

10

11 12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27 28

29 30

31

32 Attachment:

Narrative in MUR 5630

33 34

35

James A. Kahl Deputy General Counsel

BY: Gregory R. Baker

Special Counsel

Complaints Examination & Legal Administration

leff/S. Jordan/

Supervisory Attorney Complaints Examination

& Legal Administration

MUR 5630

Complainant: Mark Brewer

Respondent: Request Foods, Inc.

Allegations: The complainant alleges that Request Foods, Inc., purchased an advertisement in the Holland Sentinel daily newspaper in the form of a detachable sticker, which allegedly contained express advocacy and lacked an appropriate disclaimer. Specifically, the sticker listed two presidential candidates, George Bush and John Kerry, and provided under the heading, "Presidential Candidates Stand On Life," the candidates various voting records on abortion related legislation. After listing three examples of each candidates voting record on abortion related legislation, the advertisement stated, "Make the right choice; vote for life at the Presidential Election on November 2." At the bottom of the advertisement the respondent's name, "Request Foods, Inc.," appeared.

Response: Request Foods Inc., responded by denying that it paid for the advertising placed in the Holland Sentinel. Instead, Request Foods Inc., indicated that its president, Jack Dewitt, paid for the advertisement and supplied a credit card receipt for \$680, which represented the costs associated with the advertisement. Additionally, Request Foods Inc., attached an e-mail to its response that explains that the ad representative at the Holland Sentinel attributed the advertisement to Request Foods Inc., since no one claimed it was a personal advertisement. Finally, Mr. Dewitt filed a Form 5 with the Commission on January 18, 2005, acknowledging the independent expenditure.

Date complaint filed: December 21, 2004

Response filed: January 18, 2005